Minutes of the Agency Contract Review Board

19 November 1969

PRESENT:			
•			
			•
1 17-		000 h avena swith	
	meeting commenced at 10 gistics Briefing, in this ins		presentation of
	"Harvard Business Review	•	
	Defense Industry' deals w		
_	direct result of a "new loo	_	•
of Defense.		ent that this problem i	•
as evidenced b	y the large numbers of mid	ldle management (\$20,	000 - \$25,000) execu-
tives now seek	ing employment.		
2			:
2. L	cognizant of contracting m	announcements in the i	interest of keeping
die nord fury	cognizant of contracting in	detects. These were.	
a	. The Agency recently ent	ered into a contract w	rith
	This action was red	quested by ARPA and r	no Agency funds
were in	volved. ARPA now has red	quested a copy of the o	contractual instru-
ment.	The DD/L has approved th	is request on a one-time	me basis.
	771 1 1	riticism of	performance
h	There has been recent c		Portoritation
	There has been recent c NPIC contract which now a		eflect a over-
	NPIC contract which now		

several letters including the draft of one censuring the company. The Board concurred in the proposed letter provided it was agreed to by the Contracting Officer assigned to NPIC. next notified the Board of a recent decision by the Director of Logistics to establish a Procurement Policy Committee charged with the ad hoc review and analysis of selected contracting matters. The first area explored concerned itself with overhead overruns. A report with recommendations has been submitted to the D/L for comment, following which, the paper will become an agenda item for ACRB approval. d. At this time, reviewed the status of three ACRB projects. (1) As reported in previous minutes, the DD/S&T representative was compiling data on an existing contract. This informa-25X1 tion has now been provided and is to become the focal point of a review of Agency policy. It was agreed that this review should not be made immediately, as additional information is forthcoming from 25X1 (2) At the request of reviewed the 25X1 present status of the industrial security situation. Actually, there are three different phases under review as follows: (a) In conjunction with SS/OL is taking 25X1 the action necessary to update and issue a handbook for use by technical and project officers. The necessary preliminary work has been completed, although there is no anticipated date for issuance has requested that Physical Security Division/Office of Security revise their basic standards for contractor facilities. (c) The Blue Book issued by SS/OL covering contract security is being updated. Comments now have been received from all the contracting teams. SS/OL, is the Pro-25X1 ject Officer for this effort. made the comment 25X1 Following | remarks, that in his experience, contractor security requirements were often more strict than those of U.S. Embassies. To this responded 25X1

state-of ment the contract	ence collection concepts provided a contractor involved in the art R & D. In summary, made the comet some procedure should be developed to insure that any cor expenditure for secure facilities must be approved by the at Contracting Officer. This comment was concurred in by idees.	25X1
cedures curement been injo would no has been Agency wo this assi cleared the Arm informat establish idea and	With respect to Agency patents,	25X1 25X1 25X1 25X1
3. The final a ing contracts:	genda item involved Board review and discussion of the follow-	
saving has been In addition, the rent contract; a December 1969 not cial difficulty. In which internate make such a recussion, the Bo	This contract is for the third ar of a three year continuing project. Although originally the actual cost will approximate as some realized through use of a lower G & A rate than planned. Contractor did not utilize all funds available under the curand as a result, this renewal will become effective on 1 instead of the planned termination date of 30 September 1969. This information, requested that the port the results of ARC's indirect charges, as this is the area all difficulties are apt to appear first. agreed to port at the next meeting of the ACRB. Following further disard concurred in a recommendation to the D/L that the contracted as proposed.	25X1 25X1 25X1

	b. The Board	25X1
	reviewed this contract on a post-negotiation basis and took no exception.	
25X1	As pointed out by the fact that the contract was negotiated on a	
. ,	FPIF basis tends to preclude overruns.	
25X1	c. This contract involves the	•
	development of microcircuitry and last year was funded in conjunction with	
	ARPA. ARPA is no longer interested in the specific applications involved,	
	and ORD is funding the total amount of about This is an interesting	25X1
	proposal as the contractor is agreeable to a 50/50 cost-sharing ratio with	
	no fee involved. The Board concurred in a recommendation being made	
	for D/L approval with the following provisions:	
	(1) The EO/EO provision should be written into the contract	
	(1) The 50/50 provision should be written into the contract.	
	(2) A 305% overrate factor for one department must be ex-	
	plored and accepted by the Contracting Officer.	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ı
	(3) An audit must be completed.	
	(4) Contractor travel provisions must be clarified.	
	d.	25X1
	This was a post-negotiation review earlier requested by the Board. The	
25X1	previous docket, approved by the D/L on 5 September 1969, sug-	
	gested a FP contract redeterminable downward. The contract as actually negotiated is CPAF with a price ceiling of There was some general	0574
	discussion with respect to the relative value of the CPAF format. The Board	25X1
	agreed that this type of contract is probably used too often and recommended	
	that a review be made of Agency use of CPAF contracts. Following this dis-	
	cussion, the Board recommended the contract for D/L approval as written.	r
		:,
25X1	e. ARPA funds totaling	25X1
	have been made available for this proposal for pencil transmitters. The con-	•
•	tractor proposes a CPFF operation. There was some discussion on this case	
	with respect to the operating detail presented in the docketpointed	25X1
	out that the information on this docket had come primarily from the Form 2420	
	itself and that this document was given wide distribution. The Board agreed	
•	collectively and suggested that some common procedure be established to	
		· .

Approved For lease 2006/02/06 : CIA-RDP74B0053 000100200017-4

require close review o	of 2420's by the Contracting Officer concerned to in-	
	data is used unnecessarilysuggested	25X1
that this contract migh	at well be written as a FP transaction. After general	
discussion it was agr	eed that the CPFF format was proper in this instance;	
and accordingly the B	oard recommended the case for D/L approval.	
and accordingry, the b	oata recommended the case for 2/2 approver	1
	· ·	
		25X1
•		
٠.		
	Chairman	•
	Agency Contract Review Board	